

REMARKS

The Office has addressed the claims as follows: claims 19-20 are objected to for formal reasons and claims 17 and 19-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Endo; claims 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Karellas; claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9 and 12 of US Patent No. 5,608,774 in view of Karellas; claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 and 5 of US Patent No. 5,909,478 in view of Karellas; claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9 and 12 of US Patent No. 5,608,774 in view of Karellas; claims 14-18 are rejected under double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7 and 8 of US Patent No. 6,389,105 in view of Karellas; and claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17 and 19 of US Patent No. 6,178,224 in view of Karellas.

Objection to Claims 19-21

Claim 15 has been amended to refer to microspheres and claims 20 and 21 have been amended to refer to "imaging system" as opposed to "method." The undersigned submits that these objections are moot in view of these amendments.

Rejection of Claim 14 in View of Endo

In view of the cancellation of claim 14, the undersigned submits that this rejection is moot.

Rejection of Claims 15, 16 and 18 in View of Karellas

Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 17. As Karellas does not teach or suggest the combination of limitations set forth in claim 15 as amended, the undersigned respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot.

Rejection of Claims 14- 16 and 18 Over Claims 1, 9 and 12 of US Patent No. 5,608,774 in View of Karellas

Claim 14 has been cancelled. Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 17. As the claims of the '774 Patent either alone or in combination with Karellas do not teach or suggest the combination of limitations set forth in claim 15 as amended, the undersigned respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot.

Rejection of Claims 14- 16 and 18 Over Claims 1, 4 and 5 of US Patent No. 5,909,478 in View of Karellas

Claim 14 has been cancelled. Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 17. As the claims of the '478 Patent either alone or in combination with Karellas do not teach or suggest the combination of limitations set forth in claim 15 as amended, the undersigned respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot.

Rejection of Claims 14-18 Over Claims 7 and 8 of US Patent No. 6,389,105 in View of Karellas

A terminal disclaimer is being submitted herewith to obviate this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 14-16 and 18 Over Claims 17 and 19 of US Patent No. 6,178,224 in View
of Karellas**

Claim 14 has been cancelled. Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 17. As the claims of the '224 Patent either alone or in combination with Karellas do not teach or suggest the combination of limitations set forth in claim 15 as amended, the undersigned respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that claims 15, 16 and 18-21 are allowable over the cited prior art. A notice of allowance to this effect is requested. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned Representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/23/04
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 900
607 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5800

By: Dawn Marie Bey
Dawn-Marie Bey
Registration No. 44,442